

**DRC**  
**SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT**  
**REPORT**

**Division:** Airport

**Member:** Alex Erskine  
954-828-4966

**Project  
Name:** P. Moss

**Case #:** 23-R-04

**Date:** February 24, 2004

**Comments:**

No comments

**DRC**  
**SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT**  
**REPORT**

**Division:** Engineering

**Member:** Tim Welch  
Engineering Design Mgr.  
Office Ph. 954-828-5123  
Office Fax: 954-828-5275  
Email: [timw@cityfort.com](mailto:timw@cityfort.com)

**Project  
Name:** P. Moss

**Case #:** 23-R-04

**Date:** February 24, 2004

**Comments:**

Please Contact Tim Welch for Engineering Comments.

**DRC**  
**SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT**  
**REPORT**

**Division:** Fire

**Member:** Albert Weber  
954-828-5875

**Project  
Name:** P. Moss

**Case #:** 23-R-04

**Date:** February 24, 2004

**Comments:**

1. Flow test required.
2. Show hydrant location
3. Fire sprinklers required as per 903.8.2 FBC. It is not clear if this applicable since the 3<sup>rd</sup> level windows are not shown on the floor plan.
4. Show fire main, hydrant, DDC and FDC on Civil plan.

**DRC**  
**SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT**  
**REPORT**

**Division:** Info. Systems

**Member:** Gary Gray  
954-828-5790  
954-828-5762

**Project  
Name:** P. Moss

**Case #:** 23-R-04

**Date:** February 24, 2004

**Comments:**

No apparent interference will result from this plan at this time.

**DRC**  
**SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT**  
**REPORT**

**Division:** Landscape

**Member:** Dave Gennaro  
954-828-5200

**Project  
Name:** P. Moss

**Case #:** 23-R-04

**Date:** February 24, 2004

**Comments:**

1. Sheet LS-2 shows several potential “speciman” trees to be relocated. A Bond or other surety will probably be required prior to permit issuance to guarantee requirements. All Tree Preservation Ordinance requirements apply. Equivalent replacement for trees removed to be above min. site Code requirements.
2. Verify that trees to remain have sufficient pervious area to support the tree. Also, make sure there is no conflict with proposed structures or other trees.
3. Indicate any utilities that would affect proposed planting, such as overhead powerlines, on the Landscape Plan. All tree installation to be in accordance with FPL guidelines. Overhead lines to be placed underground.
4. Add the Vehicular Use Area landscape area calculation to the Calculation List. (This would be 20% of the gross VUA.)
5. Signoff plans to be sealed by the Landscape Architect.

**DRC**  
**SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT**  
**REPORT**

**Division:** Planning

**Member:** Mike Ciesielski  
954-828-5256

**Project  
Name:** P. Moss

**Case #:** 23-R-04

**Date:** February 24, 2004

**Comments:**

Request: Site Plan Level II/ New construction of nine (9) residential units (townhouses).

1. The proposed development is in the Sailboat Bend Historic District. Pursuant to Sec. 47-24.11, all new construction in this historic district must receive a Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction and meet the criteria as listed in Sec. 47-24.11.C. 3.i. and iii. Furthermore, this proposal must meet the Material and Design Guidelines for New Construction as outlined in Section 47-17.7. It also appears that there are existing buildings on the site. Sec. 47-24.11.C.1.a.iii. requires that you obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of any of these buildings. All Certificates of Appropriateness are granted by the Historic Preservation Board and are subject to 30 day call-up by the City Commission.

(When going before the Historic Preservation Board (“HPB”), the applicant should make sure that ALL the proposed materials and accessory structures, i.e. outdoor lights, fences, a/c condensing units, concrete piers, brick pavers, etc. on the exterior of the building or property are clearly identified with accompanying photos, product approvals, or manufacturer’s brochures).

2. In order to insure that the proposed development complies with the *Guidelines for New Construction* in the Sailboat Bend Historic District (see. Sec. 47-24.11.C.3.c.iii.), please provide front façade (south) elevations for the adjacent buildings on SW 4<sup>th</sup> Street, i.e. front facades of the buildings on Lots 7, 9, 11, 13, and 15, Block 107, as well as the front façade of the proposed buildings in a single drawing. Please also provide the rear elevation drawing(s) for those structures immediately in back of the proposed development site, i.e. those structures on Lots 2, 4, and 6, Block 107. These drawings should be drawn to scale so that the HPB will be able to ascertain whether the proposed development is in proper scale and mass to existing adjacent buildings. (Note that, in reviewing your proposal, the HPB will reference each of these criteria in determining the appropriateness of this development proposal, specifically, compatibility with reference to height, width, scale, and mass).

# **DRC**

## **SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT**

### **REPORT**

(Note, these scaled drawings will also assist the HPB in determining whether the proposal meets the criteria for reduction of setbacks...See comment # 3).

3. The proposed site plan does NOT adhere to setback requirements for front, rear, and side townhouses in the RML-25 zoning district. Pursuant to Sec. 47-17.5., the applicant may request a modification for front, side, and/or rear setback reductions. This request for yard modifications should be made to the HPB at the meeting when a Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition/New Construction is considered. Please note that the proposed development must meet the criteria in Sec. 47-17.5.A. and 1., and either 2., 3., or 4 for the yard reduction to be approved.
4. The applicant is requested to provide sections of the buildings in addition to elevations.
5. Pursuant to Sec. 47-25.2.P., *Adequacy Requirements for Historical and Archeological Resources*, this site may have archeological significance. The applicant may therefore be required to complete a Phase I (reconnaissance-level) archeological survey and written report and to comply with all state, county, and local laws pertaining to the same. At a minimum, the applicant shall be required to obtain written confirmation from the County's Historic Preservation Commission as to whether the development site has any archeological or historical significance.
6. The proposed development must comply with all of the Adequacy Requirements as listed in Section 47-25.2. To this end, please provide a point-by-point narrative as to how this development complies with this Section.
7. The proposed development must comply with all of the requirements for a townhouse development as listed in Section 47-18.33. Please provide a point-by-point narrative as to how this development complies with this Section.
8. Please show all proposed exterior lighting on all elevations.
9. Please provide a roof plan. Show the location , i.e. setbacks from the edge of the roof, of all A/C equipment. (note that, pursuant to Section 47-19.2.AA., any roof-mounted structures are required to be screened so that the structure is not visible from the ground level from any adjacent property).
10. Provide a detailed (dimensioned) drawing of the proposed fence(s). (Again, note compatibility with the Material and Design Guidelines found in Section 47-17.7 Also note that the HPB typically requests that those buildings in the Sailboat Bend Historic District that front on a street be visible from the street. Hence, it is recommended that non-opaque fences be considered in the front and corner-side yards).

**DRC**  
**SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT**  
**REPORT**

11. On site plan, please show the building footprints of those adjacent properties and their approximate distance from the subject site's property line. (This information is especially relevant when asking the HPB for a reduction of yard setbacks..... see comment # 3).
12. It is strongly recommended that the applicant revise the site plan and floor plan to have the entryway of the easternmost unit in Building # 1 facing onto SW 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The applicant may also wish to consider revising the site plan/floor building for the easternmost unit in Building # 2 so that the entryway faces SW 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue.
13. Please show direction of alley. Discuss the most appropriate direction for the alley with the Engineering Plans Examiner.
14. Discuss the proposed the type, number, and location of trees (ref. Sec. 47-18.33B.10.b), the relocation of trees, and the maintenance of the larger trees, i.e. oaks, with the Chief Landscape Plans Examiner.
15. Dimension lengths and widths of proposed buildings on the elevation plans.
16. Discuss with Chief Zoning Plans Examiner whether the proposed buildings meets the setback requirements for buildings over 22' in height.
17. Provide a narrative on the plans for solid waste disposal, i.e. where will the roll-out carts be kept and where will trash pick-up occur.
18. On site data table, properly identify the floodzone, i.e. AE 6, AE 7, etc.
19. Provisions satisfactory to the City Attorney shall be made for a recorded easement
  - a) over the driveway for all public utilities and for use by owners within the group, and
  - b) along the front and rear property lines of the group for use by owners of the group.
20. The applicant is strongly recommended to contact the Sailboat Bend Civic Association and advise them of this proposed development. It is suggested that any presentations done to the Association concerning this project be done in advance of the Historic Preservation Board meeting.
21. Additional comments may be forthcoming at the DRC meeting.



**DRC**  
**SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT**  
**REPORT**

**Division:** Police

**Member:** Detective Nate Jackson  
Office-954-828-6422  
Pager-954-877-7875  
Fax -954-828-6423

**Project  
Name:** P. Moss

**Case #:** 23-R-04

**Date:** February 24, 2004

**Comments:**

1. All glass doors/windows are to meet requirements as stipulated per FBC.
2. Recommend lighting at each garage door.
3. Recommend panic button for each garage door control.
4. Recommend intrusion/fire alarm system for each unit.
5. No further comments at this time
6. Please document response.

**DRC**  
**SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT**  
**REPORT**

**Division:** Zoning

**Member:** Terry Burgess  
954-828-5913

**Project Name:** P. Moss

**Case #:** 23-R-04

**Date:** February 24, 2004

**Comments:**

1. The proposed townhouse development is subject to review by the Historic Preservation Board pursuant to section 47-17.4. A certificate of appropriateness for new construction and demolition must be received pursuant to the guidelines of sections 47-17.7, 47-24.11.C.3.i and 47-24.11.C.1.a.iii.
2. Application for yard and minimum distance separation reduction is subject to review by the Historic Preservation Board pursuant to the requirements of section 47-17.5.
3. Provide a narrative outlining how the proposed townhouse project complies with sections 47-18.33, 47-17.4, 47-17.7, 47-24.11.C.3.i, 47-24.11.C.1.a.iii and 47-25.2.
4. Provide location of all mechanical equipment pursuant to the requirements of sections 47-19.2.S and 47-19.2.Z.
5. Provide a detail of the fence.
6. Recommend provisions for an entry on building #1 to face S.W. 10<sup>th</sup> Ave.
7. Additional comments may be discussed at the DRC meeting.

**DRC**  
**SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT**  
**REPORT**

**Division:** WaterWorks 2011

**Member:** Nannette Woods  
Planning and Coordination  
Manager  
Office Ph. (954) 522-2604, ext 16  
Email: nwoods@ch2m.com

**Project  
Name:** P. Moss

**Case #:** 23-R-04

**Date:** February 24, 2004

**Comments :**

1. The developer needs to be aware that sewer construction is planned for this area beginning in mid-2004 through late-2005. The developer will need to pay the connection fee and connect to the sewer once it is certified.